CB/gp/31163-002/#353667

REMARKS

Claim 1 is currently pending. Claim 1 was rejected by the Office Action. Claim

1 has been amended. Claims 2-4 have been added. Reconsideration of the claim, as

amended, and consideration of the new claims is respectfully requested.

A. Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. 102(b).

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent

No. 4,069,554 to Minolla et al. (hereinafter the "Minolla Reference"). The Applicant

respectfully traverses.

Claim 1, as amended, specifically requires "a first ear extending away from the

junction between the second horizontal member and the first vertical member," and "a

second ear extending away from the junction between the second horizontal member and

the second vertical member," and "wherein said ears prevent said third horizontal

member from sliding past said ears." The Office Action construed the first and second

arcuate outer-end of grip panel 16 to be the first and second ear as defined in claim 1.

These arcuate outer-end sections of the grip handle are not ears within the understanding

of the claim. The ears provide a catch ridge to prevent the third horizontal member from

sliding off during the assembly of the device.

Conversely, the design illustrated in the Minolla reference would allow the degree

of slide to be greater. Moreover, the Minolla reference inherently teaches a second

horizontal section that is much tighter in tolerance lessening the need for ears, and in fact

relies on the thrust piece 10 and the ribbed transverse web 9 to keep the locking cap 11 in

Response to Office Action mailed June 28, 2005

Response dated August 2, 2005

Inventor - Yates

Attorney Docket No.: 31104-006

Now Under: 31163-2

Serial No.: 10/648,058

Page 6 of 8

CB/gp/31163-002/#353667

place. Conversely, the ears of claim 1 "facilitate retention of the sliding horizontal

member 116 while the web adjuster 100 is first being installed upon the safety belt," as

taught in our specification on page 10, lines 6-8. Accordingly, the Minolla Reference

does not teach each and every feature of the claim and, in fact, actually teaches away

from the language as defined in claim 1.

Claims 2-4 include many of these features and other features not present or

suggested by the Minolla reference. For instance, claim 2 includes the feature of "when

said web adjuster has been rotated at least 45 degrees from a first position to a second

position." Support for this feature can be found on page 10, lines 13-15, and page 10

lines 19-20 of Applicant's specification as originally filed. The Minolla reference fails to

teach this feature. The Minolla reference teaches away from this feature on column 2,

lines 54-61, by teaching "[e]ven slight angles in the adjusting device according to the

invention will produce optimum adjustment opportunity." Hence, the Minolla reference

teaches away from requiring at least 45 degrees of rotation before the belt is able to move

with respect to the adjusting device, which is an important safety feature of the invention

defined in Applicant's claim 2. Therefore, there is no teaching or suggestion in the

Minolla reference of the features of claim 2 and therefore claim 2 is allowable over the

references of record for at least these reasons.

Claim 3 depends from independent claim 2 and therefore includes all of the

features of independent claim 2. It is therefore respectfully submitted that claim 3 is

allowable over the references of record for at least the same reasons as claim 2.

Response to Office Action mailed June 28, 2005

Response dated August 2, 2005

Inventor - Yates

Attorney Docket No.: 31104-006

Now Under: 31163-2

CB/gp/31163-002/#353667

Claim 4 includes the features of "the second horizontal member defining an

opening therethrough." The Minolla reference does not teach or suggest this feature.

The Minolla reference teaches away from this feature by teaching a solid second

horizontal member. Thus, claim 4 is allowable over the references of record for at least

this reason.

B. Conclusion

Accordingly, it is believed that claims 1-4 are in condition for allowance.

Reconsideration of the present application as amended is respectfully requested. The

Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney to address any outstanding matters

concerning the present Application.

Respectfully submitted,

By:

Troy J. Cole

Reg. No. 35,102

Woodard, Emhardt, Moriarty,

McNett & Henry LLP

Bank One Center/Tower

111 Monument Circle, Suite 3700

Indianapolis, IN 46204-5137

(317) 634-3456

Response to Office Action mailed June 28, 2005 Response dated August 2, 2005

Inventor - Yates

Attorney Docket No.: 31104-006 Now Under: 31163-2

Serial No.: 10/648,058

Page 8 of 8